REMARKS

Introduction

Claims 1 - 68 were originally pending in this application. In response to a Restriction Requirement, claims 51 - 58 were withdrawn from consideration in this application. Moreover, claims 51 - 58 have been cancelled herein. Thus, claims 1 - 50 remain pending for consideration in the application.

Double Patenting

Claims 1 - 50 were rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting over claims 1 - 72 of U.S. Patent No. 6,523,422. Both the '422 and the present application are commonly owned. The Examiner stated that, although the conflicting claims are not identical, it is the Examiner's position that they are not patentably distinct from each other. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. However, along with this response to the September 13, 2005 Office Action, applicants have filed a Terminal Disclaimer as a means for overcoming the rejection based on non-statutory double patenting grounds. In this way, it is respectfully submitted that the obvious type double patenting rejection has been obviated.

Conclusion

Claims 1 - 25 and 26 - 50 recite structure and method steps, respectively, that are not disclosed or suggested by the prior art. Accordingly, applicants respectfully solicit allowance of the claims pending in this case.

Respectfully submitted,

Gerald E. McGlynn, III

Registration No.: 33,737 BLISS McGLYNN, P.C.

2075 West Big Beaver Road, Suite 600

Troy, Michigan 48084-3443

Phone: 248-649-6090 Fax: 248-649-6299

Email: gemcglynn@ipdirection.com

Date: September 28, 2005

Attorney Docket No.: 2231.00017